DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 385 302 JC 950 367

AUTHOR	Platt, Gail M.
TITLE	Learning from the Past, or Must History Repeat Itself? The Learning Center's Annual Report, 1994-95.
INSTITUTION	South Plains Coll., Levelland, TX. Learning Center.
PUB DATE	Jul 95
NOTE	23p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Advising; Case Studies; Community Colleges; *Developmental Studies Programs; *Faculty Development; *Learning Resources Centers; *Outcomes of Education; *Remedial Instruction; Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Two Year Colleges; *Two Year College Students
IDENTIFIERS	South Plains College TX

ABSTRACT

The Learning Center (LC) at South Plains College (SPC), in Texas, was established to provide remedial instruction in learning strategies, reading, and writing; college-level instruction in critical thinking and human development; tutorial assistance; study skills seminars; and other services. During the 1994-95 academic year, over 3,466 students were served, representing a 41.9% increase over the previous year and including 1,342 who received tutorial assistance and 1,124 who attended study seminars. Student evaluations of LC instruction carried out in fall 1994 resulted in a mean rating of 4.562 on a 5-point scale, consistent with SPC's institutional mean of 4.5. However, results from the state Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP) assessment test indicate that SPC students performed at lower levels in 1994-95 than in previous years and that they performed more poorly than students statewide. Of the 1,129 SPC students who attempted the TASP Math test, for example, only 44% met the remediation standard and 126 students failed all 3 parts of the TASP. Case studies of three of these failing students revealed that in each case proper advisement could have directed the students to appropriate remedial courses that would have improved their chances for success. Finally, the faculty of the LC, which includes five professional developmental educators, participated in a process of Continuous Quality Management to improve instruction and have identified the need for greater availability of computers to enhance LC services. (June 1995 TASP data and a class reaction survey instrument are appended.) (KP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 385 302

Learning from the Past or
Must History Repeat Itself?

The Learning Center's Annual Report, 1994-95

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. Platt

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

Gail M. Platt, Ph.D.
South Plains College
Levelland, TX 79336
(806) 894-9611, ext. 240

July 1995

JC 950 367

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This annual report contains a description of activities and services provided in the South Plains College Learning Center during the 1994-95 academic year, including reports on students served, instruction and instructional outcomes, Learning Center curriculum, and faculty. The report features case studies of three students selected at random from a pool of 126 students who had failed all three parts of the Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP) Test, a state-mandated academic skills placement test. Beginning the report is a discussion of TASP and its effect on developmental education in Texas in the past six years since its inception in September 1989. Concluding the report is a discussion of the future of developmental education, especially as student demographics change the face of tomorrow's typical college student.

Learning from the Past or
Must History Repeat Itself?

The Learning Center's Annual Report, 1994-95

Introduction

Almost a decade ago, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board's Committee on Testing began its report on the need for expanded developmental education in Texas colleges and universities with the following pronouncement:

> Every year more than 110,000 freshmen enter Texas public colleges and universities. Of these, at least 30,000 cannot read, communicate, or compute at levels needed to perform effectively in higher education. Some become college drop-outs -- not because they lack the ability, but because they lack the skills. Others receive degrees without ever mastering basic skills. The tragedy is that we often do not know they are deficient until it is too late to help them. . . . they represent a generation of failure in our educational system. (***A Generation of Failure,*** 1986, p. 1).

The Committee on Testing subsequently recommended that (a) all entering college students be assessed in reading, writing, and math, (b) institutions develop advisement programs to assure accurate placement of students, (c) institutions develop remedial programs, (d) remediation be required, (e) efforts be evaluated, (f) faculty across the state be involved in the development of the assessment, and (g) the legislature provide adequate funding for assessment and remediation.

The Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP)

The result of this report was legislation creating the Texas Academic Skills Program, implemented in the fall 1989. Prior to TASP, South Plains College, like most community colleges in Texas, provided assessment of students' reading, writing, and math skills. Using the "Nelson Denny Reading Test," 59 percent of the students who entered

SPC in 1986-87 were found to read below college-level, with 29 percent reading below the ninth grade level. In writing, 40 percent had unacceptable ratings on their writing sample. In math, using a locally-developed math test, 13 percent of the students were unable to perform basic operations (addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division using whole numbers, fractions, and decimals) (Platt, 1987).

TASP scores provided to the institution by National Evaluation Systems (NES) in the spring 1995 indicated that 34 percent of students lacked reading skills, 39.5 percent lacked math skills, and 25 percent lacked writing skills sufficient to enter college-level programs of study. Moreover, only 7.6 percent of the students tested demonstrated math proficiency sufficient to undertake college algebra.

A team of researchers found that although 96 percent of the two-year institutions in Texas assessed students in reading, writing, and math, only half of the students identified as needing remedial reading actually enrolled in a reading course, and only 60 percent who needed remedial writing or math enrolled (Skinner & Carter, 1987). In other words, Texas community colleges provided assessment, but placement test scores most often were used for making recommendations, not for mandatory placement in remedial courses or programs. For example, only 36 percent of the SPC students in 1986-87 who were advised to enroll in reading remediation did so. Only 31 percent of the students who were advised to enroll in remedial writing did so.

When the college used its own assessment program prior to TASP, 35 percent of all entering students were found deficient in only one academic skill, 25 percent were deficient in two academic skills, and 9 percent were weak in all three areas (Platt, 1987). Compared to TASP performance, 25.8 percent of the students tested in June 1995 were weak in only one academic area (6.5 percent in reading, 15 percent in math, and 4.3 percent in writing); 15.2 percent were weak in two academic areas, and 9 percent were weak in all three areas. (See Table A.)

Required remediation. For a variety of reasons, students then were (as now) reluctant to accept recommendations for remedial work. Many nontraditional students are reliant on financial aid programs which may not pay for remedial courses or may place unrealistic expectations on students whose academic preparation is lacking. Some students who are paying their own way through school, likewise, are reluctant to pay for courses that do not earn degree credit. In cases where students are willing to enroll in remediation, parents sometimes are unwilling to pay for such courses.

Another reason students resist taking remedial courses is that first-generation college students frequently operate on the mistaken notion that community college programs must be completed in four regular semesters, being unaware that even few well-prepared students are able to proceed through coursework at that rate -- especially, today when students are more likely to be employed (sometimes full-time) while they pursue their education. Compounding this problem is that many college counselors, advisors, and faculty also tend to think in terms of students' completing programs of study or degree plans in four years. Rigid adherence to a prescribed plan of study allows no room for remedial coursework.

Finally, some students are convinced that high school graduation assures them of success in college-level courses; this notion seems prevalent among recent high school graduates despite the fact that the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) exit-test used to certify high school graduation in Texas measures skills -- at best -- at the eighth grade level (Ashworth, 1994). This level is insufficient for performing successfully in college-level courses, that is, if the courses are, indeed, college-level.

In a review of relevant studies, Friedlander (1982) found that only a small percentage of students who could benefit from remediation took advantage of voluntary programs. He explained that students avoid courses which require the use of the skills in which they are weak and lack confidence (such as math-intensive courses), and that students seldom participate in programs designed to correct deficiencies. When asked

why students had not taken advantage of available remediation, 40 percent of the students and 50 percent of the faculty at one institution replied that they believed students did not have time or that participation was inconvenient. Students also indicated that they did not feel that the particular skill in which they were weak (whether reading, writing, or math) was really needed in order to succeed in their courses. Friedlander's conclusion that remediation be mandatory found considerable support (Maxwell, 1980; Roueche, Baker, & Roueche, 1985; Roueche & Roueche, 1977; Rounds & Anderson, 1985).

As TASP completes its sixth year in Texas, the fact that students (and constituents) still are reluctant to remediate is evident as legislators tinker with the program, offering exemptions for students with learning disorders (including dyslexia), deaf and blind students, students in certificate programs, and older students (even as young as 45 in regard to math remediation), all populations standing to benefit greatly from opportunities (even those which are imposed) to acquire and improve academic skills for success in college and life. The messages (among others) sent by such legislation are that some groups cannot achieve proficiency (or at least not at the same level that other students attain), and that some skills (for example, math) are not as important as others.

Uncertain Future Creates Opportunity. That the future of TASP is in jeopardy should be seen as an opportunity for institutions to develop appropriate and effective local assessment, placement, and remediation policies and practices, building on what has been proven effective by TASP, in order to assure that the problems identified by the original Committee on Testing are addressed. Students who have the ability to perform, but who lack the skills, must be taught so that they can become wage-earners and taxpayers. Moreover, students who carry a diploma from an institution must possess college-level skills to grant them a realistic opportunity for further academic pursuits or for entering the world of work.

TASP data have shown that students who complete remediation are retained at higher rates and earn grade points averages comparable to those of students who never

even needed remediation (Platt, 1992). Remedial education (which makes up for the skills and content which should have been learned in high school) and developmental education (which is developmentally-, skill- and age-appropriate instruction for the skills and content not presented in high school) do produce the desired results. Students can acquire the skills needed for success in college when they enroll in the appropriate reading, writing, and math classes.

This annual report of the South Plains College Learning Center describes the operation of the Learning Center which provides remedial instruction in learning strategies and reading, reading and writing, college-level instruction in critical thinking and human development, independent-study options, supplemental instruction in basic academic areas (reading, writing, and math), tutorial assistance, and study skills seminars, among other services (including the assessment of learning styles and learning strategies). The Learning Center also offers personalized counseling, advisement, and assistance to students wishing to increase their skills and their level of performance in college classes. The Learning Center is a comprehensive academic support service.

Report Contents. Specifically, the annual report includes discussion of the students served by the Learning Center, the faculty who work with and for students in the Learning Center, and issues involving both students and faculty who are concerned about student success. An analysis of significant trends and issues affecting the future of the Learning Center also is included in this report.

Students: Who, What, and How

An Increasing Number of Students

Over 3, 466[1] students were served in the Learning Center during the 1994-95 academic year. This number represents a 41.9 percent increase over the number served

[1] This number does not include the students who enrolled in classes taught by Learning Center faculty.

the previous year, 1993-94. The total number of contacts was more than 18,691, a 55 percent increase over the previous year. The number of students receiving tutorial assistance almost doubled, increasing from 683 in 1993-94 to 1,342 in 1994-95.[2] There was also a significant increase in the number of students attending study skills seminars, increasing from 266 in 1993-94 to 1,124 in 1994-95. Outreach services for nonstudents (potential students) also more than doubled, reaching a total of 106 in 1994-95 compared to 42 in 1993-94. There also was increase in the number of students enrolling in courses taught by Learning Center faculty, up to 616 this year from 484 the previous year, but this increase can be partially attributed to the college-level reading courses (RDG 133 and 134) and human development (HD 130) course. Also, not only have the Learning Center staff and faculty seen an increase in the numbers of students served and the number of requests for services made by these students, but the staff and faculty continue to become more adept at record-keeping. Despite this observation, it is likely that these numbers understate the actual number of students served since office visits and phone calls are rarely documented.

Students and Assessment Results

Instruction. In the fall 1994, student evaluations of instruction in the Learning Center revealed a 4.562 mean rating on a 9-item 5-point Likert scaled instrument used systemwide. This rating was consistent with the institutional mean of 4.5, and somewhat better than the 4.31 rating achieved in the fall 1993. Some qualifications, however, are in order since three of the four instructors in the Learning Center are tenured and did not participate in the student evaluation process; moreover, the one nontenured instructor teaches only one to two courses each semester as his responsibilities lie in other instructional areas (labs).

[2] This number is for both the fall 1994 and spring 1995 semester and, therefore, is a duplicated count.

Instructors in the Learning Center use a variety of classroom assessment tools and techniques to evaluate teaching effectiveness. For an example of a classroom assessment tool, please refer to Attachment A.

Reading and TASP Performance. Another tool for assessing the effectiveness of instruction in the Learning Center is the collection and analysis of TASP data indicating the success of students who enroll in reading courses. In the fall 1994, 137 students enrolled in reading courses; 121 were enrolled in remedial courses, 26 were enrolled in college-level reading courses, and 20 were enrolled in non-course-based remediation. At the highest level of remediation offered, 74 percent of the students enrolled successfully completed the course; however, 56 percent of those who successfully completed the course *did not* attempt the TASP Test during the fall semester. Therefore, for the majority of students in the course, there is no data to support either the success or failure of the course in regard to effectiveness for TASP preparation. Of the 20 students who did attempt the TASP Reading Test, 13 (65 percent) did pass.

In the intermediate level remedial course, 33 of the 49 students who enrolled (67 percent) successfully completed the course; 20 attempted the TASP Reading Test, and 8 (40 percent) passed. In the lowest level remedial course, 8 of the 11 students enrolled successfully completed the course; 3 attempted the TASP Reading Test, but none passed. It should be noted that students enrolled in the intermediate or lowest level remedial courses are not expected to be prepared for passing the TASP Test after only one semester of remediation.

Of the 20 students who participated in non-course-based remediation in reading, 8 (25 percent) did not successfully complete the recommended program of remediation. Only 3 of the 15 who did complete remediation attempted the TASP Reading Test and 2 (67 percent) passed; since the majority of those completing remediation did not attempt the TASP Reading Test, reliable data on the effectiveness of non-course-based remediation are not available.

Assessment of components within the purview of the Learning Center has identified significant issues for the Learning Center in regard to instruction; these include (a) the proper placement of students into developmental courses on the basis of TASP scores; (b) the continuance of students in remediation until the TASP is passed; (c) the inappropriateness of TASP standards to ensure college-entry level skills; (d) the lack of collegiate standards in reading and writing across the curriculum; and (e) the importance of administrative support for assessment, placement, and remediation. Items a, b, and e can be addressed through the cooperative and informed efforts of faculty, advisors, administrators, and students. However, a confounding factor this year was the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board's decision to rescind the 230 remediation standard on the TASP Reading and Math Tests in January 1995 which meant that several students who had preregistered for the college-level reading course (RDG 133) and a lab (RDG 000) were no longer required to participate in remediation. The Registrar's Office contacted these individuals and advised them to drop the RDG 133 course, in effect, reducing contact-hour funding for reading. Many other institutions in the state required students to enroll in appropriate courses and then, after the Coordinating Board's January 17 meeting (at which time the standard issue was officially approved), notified students of an option to drop the course (this being after the twelfth class day). Such action at SPC would have benefited the reading program and sent students the message that reading is important. Item c is a continuing challenge to the state legislature and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board; item d is an important issue for all of higher education.

Effectiveness of the Curriculum (Including Overall TASP Performance)

One change was offered to the Curriculum Committee by the Learning Center this academic year in regard to the College Success Course (HD 130). The descriptive title was changed as was the course description to match clearly the definition for social

psychology as stated in the ***Community College General Academic Course Guide Manual*** (See Attachment B.)

An important curricular issue for the Learning Center is the success of the reading curriculum in preparing students for TASP success and, beyond TASP, classroom success. Official TASP data reveal that SPC students as a group continue to perform poorly on all parts of the TASP Test. For example, based on TASP Test data for SPC students taking the test at the September, November, January, or February administrations (1994-95), of the 1,051 students taking the test, 66 percent met the minimum standard in reading, 61 percent met the minimum standard in math, and 69 percent met the passing standard in writing. For purposes of comparison, the fall 1993 data showed 74 percent passing reading, 62 percent passing math, and 78 percent passing writing. In all areas, SPC students performed significantly poorer in 1994-95 than in past years.

Statewide data collected over a four year-period (cohort data from 1989-90 through 1992-93) showed students' steady but slow decline in reading performance with passing rates ranging from 88.5 percent in 1989-90 to 85.8 percent in 1992-93), an irregular pattern but slight decline in math (from 78.7 percent passing in 1989-90 to 77.3 percent passing in 1992-93), and a steady improvement in writing (from 79.3 percent passing in 1989-90 to 81.8 in 1992-93). Again, SPC students consistently perform more poorly than do students statewide; however, such may be reasonably expected at open-admissions institutions.

The point, nonetheless, is that entering students continue to demonstrate serious skill deficiencies in reading, writing, and mathematics. This point is made even clearer by examining students' performance on the TASP Math Test. Of the 1,129 SPC students who attempted the TASP Math Test in 1994-95, only 44 percent met the remediation standard (scaled score of 230 or higher). Worse still was that only 5 percent (or 56 of the total tested) indicated readiness for college algebra by their performance on the TASP Math Test. In writing, 31 percent of SPC students required remediation; 34 percent

required remediation in reading; and, 39 percent required remediation in math. In other words, more than a third of SPC students taking the TASP Test are not prepared to undertake college-level study.

Three Case Studies. Of even greater concern is that 126 students (or 12 percent) failed all three parts of the TASP Test, thus indicating serious deficiencies in all basic skills. Case studies of three students, selected at random from this population, shed some light on the particular needs of these students. One 22 year-old white male failed all three parts of the TASP Test in November 1994. A law enforcement major, he enrolled in three law enforcement courses, orientation, a physical education course, and a remedial English course in the fall. He earned C's in his law enforcement and orientation courses, an A in physical education, and a PR grade in English, ending the semester with a 2.22 GPA; this spring, he changed his major to electrical utilities technology, enrolling in eight hours of EUT, a physical education course, and beginning algebra. This student appears to be one who not only lacked academic skills in reading, writing, and math to undertake college-level study, but also one who needed career counseling and advisement; interestingly, the program selected this spring by the student has a certificate option which exempts the student from the requirements of TASP.

A second student, a 21 year-old white female, failed all three parts of the TASP Test (very narrowly missing the Reading Test) in November 1994. In the fall, she was enrolled in six-hours of college-level courses (government and history), a remedial math course, and orientation. She withdrew from history, made a D in government, received a PR in remedial math, and a B in orientation, ending the semester with a 1.50 GPA. She did not enroll for the spring semester. This student may be an example of one whose academic future would have been brighter had she been advised to enroll in more than one remedial course in order to build skills that would have increased her chances of success in academic core courses.

The third student was a 35 year-old white female who earned a GED in 1992. She first enrolled at SPC in the first summer session 1992, attempting introductory chemistry, but withdrawing. At the same time, she attempted the TASP and failed all three parts for the first time. In the second summer session, she enrolled in and completed nursing math (with a PR). In the fall 1992, she enrolled in 13 hours, including remedial English (which she completed with a PR), beginning algebra (earning a B), and a remedial reading course (with an A), earning a cumulative 3.67 GPA. During the fall 1992, she also attempted the TASP again, improving her math score (but still not passing), and her reading score stayed the same. In the spring 1993, she enrolled in two remedial courses (English and math) and two core classes, earning a 3.33 GPA. At this time, she also attempted the TASP Test two more times; the first time in February, she attempted only the writing portion, and her score remained the same (still not passing); in April, she attempted only the reading portion and scored worse than before. In the second summer session1993, this student attempted a remedial English course and biology, but withdrew from both courses. She also attempted the TASP for the fifth time, taking the writing portion and scoring lower than before.

In the fall 1993, she attempted the biology course she had first attempted in the summer and earned a C. She also enrolled in introductory chemistry (earning a B), remedial English (receiving a PR), and a psychology course from which she withdrew; her GPA for the fall 1993 semester was 2.50. For the sixth time, she attempted the TASP Writing Test, scoring lower than ever before. She enrolled in a nutrition course for the winter term, earning a B. In the Spring 1994, she attempted two biology courses, a remedial math course, and a psychology course. She earned an A in psychology, a PR in math, and withdrew from the two biology courses. She took the TASP Test two more times during that same semester. Attempting the Reading Test two years after taking a remedial reading course, she scored lower than her first two attempts, but higher than her last attempt; her writing score remained the same.

In the summer 1994, this student enrolled in a biology course and beginning algebra (the same math course she took in the fall 1992, earning a B at that time); she withdrew from the biology course. In the fall, she re-attempted the biology course and intermediate algebra, withdrawing from both. She, for the ninth time, took the TASP, earning her best math score, but still not passing. She did not enroll in the spring 1995. All in all, this student attended South Plains College for two years, matriculated ten times, attempted the TASP Test nine times, started with a 3.67 GPA which gradually declined to a 3.25, and earned 32 SCH, completing only 56 percent of the courses she attempted. Her best TASP scores were a 212 in reading (her first attempt), 210 in math, and 200 in writing (also her first attempt). This case study profiles a student who may indeed have the intelligence and ability to complete college courses when taken one at a time and with tutorial support, but who, because of academic background and history, lacks the academic skills to perform consistently or to attempt a full academic load. This was a student in need of extensive and intensive advisement.

Three Options. Three options surface in providing for at-risk students. The first, and best option, is to provide extensive and thorough remediation, enabling these students to acquire the necessary skills and perform successfully in the college-level program of their choice. A second option is to dilute the curriculum and lower academic standards; although this may be a simpler option, it is unsatisfactory for obvious reasons. The third option, likewise unsatisfactory, is to shut the community college's "open door" and let in only those students who come fully prepared. With increased numbers of nontraditional students seeking post-secondary education and the fact that recent high school graduates' TAAS scores show only limited, if any, improvement in recent years, the third option would likely translate into a very small population of qualified students.

Therefore, the Learning Center faculty recommend that SPC administrators and board members examine the demographics of our student population, including the data on TASP performance, and adequately fund remediation in order to ensure quality

standards and guaranteeing that the "open door" does not take students down a road of limited opportunity or become a "revolving door" ensuring that students exit almost as rapidly as they enter. With over a third of SPC students requiring some kind of remediation, it would seem to suggest that a third of SPC instructional resources be devoted to providing the best kind of remediation possible.

Faculty: Professional Developmental Educators

Five professional developmental educators are employed in the South Plains College Learning Center. The Director of the Learning Center holds a doctor philosophy degree in human development. The three tenured assistant professors of reading each hold a master's degree plus a minimum of 24 graduate hours in a content field. The lab instructor also holds a master's degree. All professional employees are employed full-time.

Faculty in the Learning Center are assessed by (a) exceeding SACS criteria and possessing identified skills and competencies at the time of employment; (b) annually providing documentation of professional development activities; and (c) routine student evaluations. (Student evaluations, also used to evaluate instruction, were described in the preceding section of this report.)

The Future of Developmental Education and the SPC Learning Center

At the 1995 College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA) Conference, a roundtable session set as its goal identifying issues for developmental educators and defining the future for developmental education. Working in breakout groups, participants reached consensus concerning the following four goals: (1) Developmental educators must be proactive (anticipating trends, issues, etc.), (2) Developmental educators must be politically active (telling the story of developmental education, setting standards in post-secondary education; empowering students to tell their own stories of success; pursuing funding for developmental education, etc.); (3) Developmental educators must demonstrate accountability (by collecting and analyzing data concerning

students outcomes, publishing findings); and (4) Developmental educators must become experts in technology (creating and using computer classrooms, producing multimedia presentations, participating in distance learning, using networks, etc.).

The faculty in the Learning Center attempt to live at the cutting edge when it comes to their professional development, therefore, these goals are embraced and efforts are expended to actualize each of the goal statements. For example, hrough the institutional process of **CQI (Continuous Quality Management)**, the faculty and staff in the Learning Center have used *vision* techniques to explore the issues of managing and becoming expert in technology. Specifically, faculty (and students) in the Learning Center have identified the need for more computer support in terms of both (a) greater availability of computers to be used for specific applications (word processing, networking, electronic communication, CD ROMs, multimedia presentations/classroom instruction, etc.), and (b) greater capability of computers to perform sophisticated operations (the need for more RAM in the file server, 486 processors, CD ROM drives, Internet access, etc.). More sophisticated hardware would also permit more sophisticated applications (such as Windows).

Academic support programs can be enhanced significantly by the availability and use of new technologies; however, the use of sophisticated technologies requires capital expenditures, the like of which the Learning Center has not seen in several years. In sum, the Learning Center is failing to keep pace with the educational technologies which can revolutionize learning and truly provide both access and quality for SPC students who, as a group, tend to be at-risk for academic success. Each year we fail to make progress, we lag farther behind with the chances of keeping pace becoming more remote. In addition to the requirements for equipment, the Learning Center faculty must also receive training in the use of sophisticated applications; this training also requires financial support in the form of professional development funding.

Conclusion. The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP, 1994) found that despite more than decade of attempting to reform public education and improve the academic preparation of high school graduates, little progress (if any) has been made. Recent data from the NAEP concerning the reading skills of high school seniors paints an even bleaker picture than what had been predicted, with the majority of students reporting that they hardly ever read in school and never read outside school. Even if recent TAAS performance is taken into consideration, the situation identified in ***A Generation of Failure*** has not improved.

Perhaps policy-makers are not all wrong when they lament that "taxpayers are having to pay twice" [to teach basic academic skills] (Nancy Atlas, ***The Dallas Morning News***, November 21, A20); however, such comments are short-sighted when directed at higher education because they fail to take into account the diversity of today's student body in colleges and universities. Today's typical student is **not** an eighteen year-old male, recent high school graduate who takes 15 semester credit hours each term, relies on mom and dad to pay his bills, including tuition and fees, and has plenty of time to study and party. Today's typical student may have just as strong a desire to party and enjoy college life, but **she** is a **returning student**, not a recent high school graduate; she **works** to not only pay for her schooling, but also to support her family, which means she attends college on a **part-time** basis. John Roueche, Director of the Community College Leadership Program at the University of Texas, recently identified the availability of childcare as the number one issue affecting community college enrollments in the future (informal remarks, South Plains College, Levelland, TX, April 4, 1995).

Although nontraditional students may be highly motivated to succeed and mature enough to handle the social and psychological demands of college life, they often need, in addition to student support services (such as childcare and financial aid), substantial academic support services. Many, if not most, will require some developmental

coursework in order to review the specialized reading, writing, and math skills prerequisite to academic success.

Community colleges desiring future growth and success will take into account the many and varied needs of today's students. Based on its historical record, an investment in developmental education will prove to be a wise move.

References

Ashworth, K. (1994, November). An Interview with the Commissioner of Higher Education. ***TJCTA Messenger,*** XXVI (2).

Committee on Testing. (1986, July). ***A generation of failure.*** Austin, TX: The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board.

Friedlander, J. (1982). Should remediation be mandatory? ERIC Report. ***Community College Review,*** 9, 56-64.

Maxwell, M. (1981). ***Improving student learning skills.*** San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

National Assessment of Educational Progress. (1994). ***The national report card.*** Washington, D.C: The United States Department of Education.

Platt, G. M. (1992). Assessing program effectiveness: It's a tough job but somebody's got to do it. ERIC Document No. ED 346 916.

Platt, G. M. (1987). A commitment to literacy. ERIC Document No. ED 297 795.

Roueche, J. E., Baker, G. A., III, & Rouche, S. (1985). Access with excellence: Toward academic excellence in college. ***Community College Review,*** 12, 4-9.

Roueche, J. E., & Roueche, S. D. (1977). ***Developmental education: A primer for program development and evaluation.*** Atlanta: Southern Region Education Board.

Rounds, J. C., & Anderson, D. (1985). Placement in remedial college classes: Required versus recommended. ***Community College Review,*** 13, 20-27.

Skinner, E. F., & Carter, S. (1987). ***A second-chance for Texans: Remedial education in two-year colleges.*** Tempe, AZ: National Center for Post-secondary Governance at Arizona State University.

TABLE A

Analysis of June 1995 TASP Data
for South Plains College
Levelland Campus Only
N = 279

Passed All Parts of TASP	Failed only reading	Failed only math	Failed only writing
n = 140 (50%)	n = 18 (6.5%)	n = 42 (15%)	n = 12 (4.3%)

Failed All Parts of TASP	Failed reading and math	Failed reading and writing	Failed math and writing
n = 25 (9%)	n = 22 (8%)	n = 11 (4%)	n = 9 (3.2%)

Data reported by Gail M. Platt, Ph.D., Director of the Learning Center, South Plains College, Levelland (August 1995).

ATTACHMENT A

Class Reaction Survey

I would like to know your reactions to today's class. Please read each of the statements below and circle the letter corresponding to the response which best matches your reaction to class today. Your choices are:

A = No improvement needed. (Great ideas! I understood it all.)
B = A little improvement needed. (I didn't get it all, but I did get some good ideas!)
C = Improvement is needed. (It wasn't awful, but I didn't get much at all out of what we did in class today.)
D = Much improvement needed. (I didn't get anything out of what we did today. I felt my time was wasted.)

Today, the instructor

A B C D 1. Limited what was covered to a manageable amount of material.

A B C D 2. Made it clear why the material might be important.

A B C D 3. Told how we could use the material being presented.

A B C D 4. Highlighted key ideas or questions.

A B C D 5. Presented many good examples to clarify concepts.

A B C D 6. Provided enough variety to keep us reasonably alert.

A B C D 7. Found ways to get us involved in the material.

A B C D 8. Helped us summarize the main ideas we were supposed to get from the class.

9. What is your overall rating of the class?
A = excellent
B = good
C = satisfactory
D = weak
F = stunk

10. What kept you from rating the class higher?

ATTACHMENT B

REVISED FALL 1993

COURSE REVISION

CHECK REVISION(S)

_____ Prefix
_____ Lec./Lab hrs.
_____ Prerequisites

__X__ Title Change
__X__ Course Description

_____ **PREFIX REVISION HAS BEEN APPROVED BY THE REGISTRAR.**

DEPARTMENT **The Learning Center**

Course(s) to be revised (include course prefix, number, lecture-lab hours, title and description for both the current course and the revised course)

CURRENT COURSE **HD 130 (3:3:0) COLLEGE SUCCESS COURSE Based on principles of psychology, this course is designed to help students identify personal strengths, develop interpersonal skills (especially self-management skills), and apply those strengths and skills for success in college, on the job, and in their personal lives. This course is recommended for students on academic probation and is required for students returning to college after academic suspension or by placement by the Admissions Committee. (PSYC 2312)**

REVISED COURSE **HD 130 (3:3:0) SELF-MANAGEMENT FOR SUCCESS IN A CHANGING WORLD The study of individual behavior within social contexts, emphasizing cognitive, metacognitive, and psycho-social processes. Based on principles of developmental psychology, this course includes personal assessments, attitude formation and change, interpersonal relations, group processes, and the processes of adjustment. This course is recommended for students on academic probation and is required for students returning to college after academic suspension or by placement by the Admissions Committee. (PSYC 2312)**

JUSTIFICATION **The revised course title and description not only capture course content, but the course description is worded to conform to the CCGACGM's description** ("The study of individual behavior within the social environment. May include topics such as the socio-psychological process, attitude formation and change, interpersonal relations, and group processes" No. 42.1601.51 42). **The description also is parallel with the descriptions of courses taught at public four-year colleges** (Lamar University, Stephen F. Austin University, and Angelo State).

C.B. APPROVAL #: 42.1601.51 42

_____
DEPARTMENTAL CHAIRPERSON
DATE_____

_____
DEAN
DATE_____

_____
CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
DATE_____

_____
ACADEMIC COUNCIL
DATE_____